

Comments on Deer Questions 1 - 6

—Allow 48 hours to take a deer to a check station instead of the 24 hours currently allowed

With a person taking a deer to a check station for a hunter, then no problem in getting the deer in within 24 hrs. Also hunters have ample time in 24 hrs. to get deer to check-in station. Same as for turkey check-in, 24 hrs is ample time.

good idea. I made it to a check station last Thanksgiving evening with only minutes to spare.

If you take the time to kill this deer, then it is your responsibility to check the deer in. If you allow 48 hours, then poaching will increase because on ground checking antlers (someone else checking in deer is irresponsible.)

48 hours is too long to possess a deer before processing. Why can't a toll-free number be established to report harvested deer.

support, but poachers don't take deer to check stations. Think about it.

Anyone taking any wildlife of any kind should have to check them in themselves, if required. electronic deer checking. either by phone or computer.

Concerning the Check Stations, I can remember in the 70,s all you had to do was to send in part of your tag instead of going to a check station , wouldn't this be more cost effective than check stations and simpler ? Just an Idea. Thanks for the great hunting in this great state.

I strongly agree with the proposal for extending deer check in to 48 hours as this will help out people who hunt in the evening after work, and allowing someone else to check in the animal would also be helpful.

On the proposals for a 48 hour check in the time limit for both turkey and deer it only makes common sense to vote yes for the simple fact for example in the areas around the southwestern counties of the state in which me and family and friends do most of our hunting check in stations mainly consist of local hunting and bait store retailers which have closing times around about the time most hunters are calling it a day. It would be nice to have more state operated check stations open later at least until 11 pm or make it to where hunters could take their deer to the local state police post or sheriff station for check in and make it possible for hunters which for reasonable reasons let it be work schedules or possibly handicap or disability problems sign their deer or turkey over to another person so that their kill can be turned in within the legal check in times whether it stays 24 hours or 48 hours and as for the proposal for fall turkey season yes yes yes as long as the turkey population can withstand the hunting pressure and in my opinion in our southwestern counties of the state the turkey population is expanding and doing well as a matter of fact if it keeps going soon I will be proposing a urban season in my home county of Vanderburgh. I have begun to see a lot of wild turkey sign and even a few nice birds only 5 miles outside of Evansville city limits. Thank you

Sorry, this is not about the above proposals but I think you should of considered the one on call in for checking a deer in, due to warm weather during bow season it is a problem to try and get a deer checked in that was taken during late evening. If the check station close to me is closed I'd rather be able to quarter the deer and but it in fridge to prevent spoilage then to drive a long distance to find a check station. As long as the temporary tag is filled out I see no problem in being able to pick up the permanent tag the next day. A deer need's to be cooled ASAP. Thank you for your time.

Those taking either deer or turkey have the responsibility to have that animal checked within 24-hours.

Questions #1,2,& 7 should not be permitted because of possible spoilage of animal in warmer weather, as well as the person not being the taker/hunter not having all the facts, possibly causing them to supply inaccurate information to just "get it over with."

turn Rush county into a 1 county

I strongly support allowing 48 hours for deer.

The deer check in proposal needs left at 24 hours of killing as well. 1

I think that if you wait 48 hours to tag a deer, people may not tag them at all. They will process then and start all over. 1

48 hour check in would make life a-lot easier. 1&7

I also have somewhat mixed feelings about extending the check-in time to 48 hours. On the down side, it gives those that poach a little more opportunity to get away with something. Then again, if they are going to poach they probably aren't all that worried about the check-in time. But at least for those trying to obey the rules it makes it a bit easier, although the check in at Wal-mart is open 24 hrs a day, 365 days a year. Thanks for this opportunity to express my feelings.

48 hours is too long. Unless the weather is just right or the animal is kept in a cooler it will not last that long. I think the DNR did a good thing in going to a one-buck limit. Let's see how the five-year study goes before making any other changes.

2. Clarify that individuals other than the person who killed the deer can take the deer to the check station instead of only the person who killed the deer as allowed currently.

Oppose allowing other individuals to take a deer to a check station because it makes it easier for someone to kill 2 bucks and use another's tag.

why help people out with rule; it will just make it easier to kill more deer than legal.

I am against the checking in of deer by anyone. I believe this will encourage the illegal shooting of excessive deer and checking in name of someone else.

3. Prohibit the possession of electronic deer calls. Present rules do not prohibit their possession.

Electronic deer calls are not a problem; hunters should be allowed to continue to use them.

Completely opposed to prohibiting the use of electronic deer calls. There is no proof that electronic deer calls are any more effective than mouth or hand calls. Laws allow the use of many technologies that help deer hunters take deer including scopes, sabot slugs, rifled slug barrels, bow release aids, high tech lures, rangefinders, and other innovations.

Anything that would bring a deer closer to the hunter will make the deer woods safer and reduce the number of wounded animals. Besides, you are only allowed one buck per year. You should be allowed to use an electronic call to get that buck. Do not compare deer hunting to waterfowl hunting. They are very different pursuits.

if you can prohibit the use of electronic deer calls, you should be able to prohibit the use of electronic spotlights during the archery and gun seasons like other states do. This will greatly reduce the poaching of large bucks.

4. Allow muzzle loaders to use sabots and use only black powder or black powder substitutes; change muzzle loader restriction from .44 caliber to bullets of at least .357 inch or larger. This would allow the use of sabot bullets in .45 caliber muzzleloaders and prohibit the use of smokeless powder in a muzzleloader.

You guys have been watching too much TV. Any BP rifle will shoot just as far as the Savage ML 10 with smokeless powder or with BP. Wayne County New York Federation President

Sabots out of .45 caliber muzzleloader are too small in my opinion.

Sir, Being a hunter and non-resident landowner in the state of Indiana I am contacting you to voice my disagreement with the smokeless powder ban in muzzleloaders. I have owned and used a Savage Muzzleloader for 3 years. While there is a slight performance gain it is the reduced maintenance that I like about it.

I do not understand the reasoning behind the ban when in the same paragraph you want to allow .45 cal muzzleloaders shooting .357 bullets with even greater performance than the .50 Savage. You say it is for safety but yet I can use a 16" barreled pistol with any of the center fire cartridges such as the .300 Winchester Magnum. The newer sabot shotgun slugs even out perform the Savage using smokeless powder and I do not see you banning them. And now what about some manufactures increasing Black Powder loads to 250 grains.

You want to allow .357 sabot bullets which are high performance when shot from modern inline muzzleloaders with fast twist rifling and large powder charges. But how are you going to stop the guy with the .45 caliber Kentucky rifle with 1 in 66" rifling and a 40 grain powder charge using a 200 grain .357 sabot bullet, you think he can hit something at 100 yards with that load and if he did hit it will it put the animal down, I doubt it.

I hate to say this but it almost seems that your department is bending to the will of people lobbying for major manufacturers in the muzzle loading industry to eliminate competition of the smokeless muzzleloader manufactures (one is even an Indiana company) and open up the market in Indiana for their .45 caliber rifles.

If the “Traditional” muzzleloaders are crying then what about a “Traditional” muzzleloader season earlier in the year like the start of bow season. Make it truly traditional with no scopes, side lock only, patched lead bullets.

I am very disappointed in the track that the State of Indiana is taking in the proposed rule change. If the cause that is driving the change is actually safety, then why allow .45 cal muzzleloaders and center fire rifle cartridges in pistols? Both have more muzzle velocity and carry further than the .50 caliber muzzleloader, no matter what type of powder is used. Furthermore, both Pyrodex and Triple 7 are classified as smokeless for shipping. Is the State trying to say that only black powder can be used, no substitutes?

If the State would look further, there is a manufacturer that is advertising a muzzle velocity of 2,900 fps with a 200 grain load of Pyrodex.

What is the State’s definition of smokeless powder? Who is the sponsor of this proposed rule change?

I questioned the State about the ban on using rifles for deer hunting while they are legal for varmints, and they answered “There are fewer varmint hunters, so the risk is less.”

How many muzzle loading hunters are there? How many deer hunters use a pistol?

I oppose this proposal, and sincerely hope that is NOT put into law.

I wish to add to the comments that encourage you to reconsider your statements relating to smokeless powder use in muzzle loading rifles. As others have stated, the concern that the use of smokeless powder posing a safety hazard is poorly founded. In fact, other weapons legal in Indiana, such as center fire pistols and some inline muzzleloaders using Pyrodex and Triple Seven have muzzle velocities and trajectories that equal, or surpass, smokeless powder muzzleloaders. The technology associated with shotgun slugs is not yet in the above category, but is getting close. If you personally are not familiar with the facts related to modern weapons I suggest you find someone in your agency, or a CO who is and ask them to go over some of these facts. As you well know, any wildlife management decision is best made when based on sound science, not supposition or superstition.

It seems to me that considering smokeless powder in a muzzleloader as a safety hazard is a very slippery slope. Just what velocities and ballistics constitute a safety hazard? How do you establish this threshold? Who gets to decide when the line of public safety has been crossed? Even if there were solid answers to those questions, wouldn’t the parameters change as the human population density and terrain change? It is my opinion that the DNR is setting itself up for comments from the anti-hunting groups stating that other, more traditional, weapons pose safety risks since there is no agreed upon way to establish just where the lines are drawn.

Yes, I have seen the idea of the primitive muzzleloader change from the open site, round ball and patch, flintlock/percussion change into something totally different from what muzzle loading season was supposed to be "all about". However, that cat has long left the bag as sabots, in-lines, primers, pelleted powder, scopes and so on have replaced the old replica models. The increased range and efficiency of these new weapons is not due to any one feature, but rather are related to the many changes (I won't say improvements!) that have been made. To pick smokeless powder as the place to draw the line is apocryphal and arbitrary and won't withstand a concerted effort to overturn it.

Please reconsider your agency's statements and review just what it is you wish to accomplish. And remember how often you have been frustrated when others have ignored solid science to make statements or accusations that just don't hold up to informed scrutiny.

thanks for listening, I hope you take the time to make an informed decision.

What would it take to have the rules concerning "legal" projectiles for muzzle loaders changed? Currently the rules require at least a 44caliber projectile. For decades this rule has been very reasonable, but now with the development of sabots and better projectiles for muzzle loaders, this rule needs to be revisited.

My reasons are as follows. The current laws have allowed me to use a 45cal rifle to harvest dozens of deer over the years firing a 45 cal. round ball and patch. That projectile weighs around 135 grains, and on impact with bone can expand to over 1/2" in diameter. However without impacting bone, the round ball expands very little.

If I go to the minimum power hand gun allowed (.357 magnum) and look at the projectiles available for it I can see that there are a number of 158 grain to 180 grain projectiles that have been developed by manufacturers specifically for hunting purposes. These bullets weigh more, and have a smaller diameter, and are jacketed. All 3 of these properties allow them to penetrate better than my 45 caliber ball and patch load. Their hollow point and soft point design allows them to expand to over 1/2" diameter just like my ball and patch load. Their longer boring surface allows them to be stabilized better and thus shoot more accurately resulting in less wounded game. The point that I am trying to make here is that there are now projectiles available in .357 caliber and 40 caliber (10mm) that are better suited for taking game than the ball and patch loads that have always been around, and even better than some of the 44 caliber handgun bullets that are currently available (such as 180 and 200 grain 44 caliber bullets).

My suggestion would be that the caliber restriction be lowered to either .357" or 40 caliber, but that a bullet weight restriction be added. If the .357 projectiles are allowed, then I would suggest a 180 grain minimum bullet weight. If the 40 caliber projectiles are the smallest diameters allowed, then I would suggest a minimum projectile weight of 200 grains. This alteration to the rules would allow hunters to use better projectiles for hunting and still restrict them from mistakenly using projectiles that are not designed for hunting purposes.

Following several e-mails I traded with Ms Petercheff, her last response, after considering various aspects of the ballistics of a muzzleloader firing smokeless powder vs. muzzleloaders using charges of pyrodex or triple seven was that: she was referring the proposal back to her staff “ To question if the smokeless issue should be pursued further.” One confusion other than ballistic differences was the definition of “smokeless.” powder. Pyrodex pellets have a label declaring it to be a “smokeless rifle propellant”, it is classed as a combustible solid, the same as smokeless powder, black powder is a class A explosive. So what is the Indiana definition of smokeless powder?

After her reply last week, I went on a hunting trip to KY, and to my surprise, found the regulation proposal on your website changed when I returned. It read to ban smokeless powder use in muzzleloaders, the .45 cal permission was deleted.

Comments on the smokeless ban proposal cited the long range of the muzzleloaders based on a concern for safety. *This is the incredible part of the proposed change.*

In light of ballistic facts and common sense, it is hard to respond rationally to the “safety concern” cited as the reason for the proposed smokeless ban in muzzleloaders because there is a terrible inconsistency in the existing regulations and it relates directly to safety.

Per current regulations, I can legally hunt deer with a centerfire pistol chambered for one of several large calibers, (.243 or larger, in a pistol with a barrel exceeding 4 inches.) A 30-06 pistol firing a 150 grain bullet with a muzzle velocity of between 2500 and 3000 feet per second is not a “safety concern”, but my Savage ML-10 pushing a 250 grain bullet at 2300 feet per second IS a safety concern? Barrel length doesn’t matter, the centerfires all have a range far exceeding my muzzleloader. Its effective range is about 250 yards, then the bullet drops almost like a rock. Banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders based on safety is prejudicial to one gun type and makes absolutely no sense.

I can’t believe the Indiana DNR can propose this regulation change with a straight face.

I have a question. How did the rule change to ban the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloader season get added on to the rule change to be able to use .357 bullets or larger in .45 caliber muzzleloaders? These two rules are completely different in nature and should be considered two different rule changes. The way it is written on your survey questionnaire a yes vote allows one and bans the other. Smokeless powder is a black powder substitute and should be allowed in muzzleloader season. If you ban the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders you will be putting another Indiana manufacture out of business. Smokeless Muzzleloader Inc. in Hartford City makes smokeless muzzleloaders will go out of business and more Hoosier jobs lost. There is no winner in this rule change.

Dear Sirs, I strongly urge you to reject the proposal that bans smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. Some folks may think it charming to have to clean their rifle every time they fire it. I do not. Muzzleloading is much more enjoyable for me without the hassle of black powder.

As a long time public school teacher and school administrator you will be happy to know that I am encouraging all of my teaching friends to use your proposed rule change to demonstrate to the students of Indiana how government can take a good idea and ram a bad idea down the throat of the citizens they are supposed to service. I'm referring to the proposed rule change that restricts the use of smokeless power in muzzle loading rifles but starts out by liberalizing the use of sabot size in muzzle loading fire arms. The two questions are completely and totally different, and should not be lumped together.

You sir, are a perfect example of what a public official should not be, devious. I respectfully ask you to act in a forthright and honest manner in the performance of your duties and take this item off the table until proper research can be conducted to determine if banning smokeless powder is necessary to protect the deer herd or the public. Please leave your survey up it is a wonder teaching tool to high light government at it's worst.

I feel the hunters who shoot smokeless powder muzzleloaders will be unfairly discriminated against if the proposal concerning allowing .357 sabot bullets in .45 caliber misleaders is not modified to EXCLUDE banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. What is the purpose of this ban? Why was banning smokeless powder added to this proposal? I saw nothing in the rational of the original proposal that said anything about banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. It appears that someone added this language as an after thought hoping to sneak it by. This part of this proposal would discriminate against the owners of Savage muzzleloaders. Why is this being proposed? I own three smokeless muzzleloaders and have a lot of money tied up in them as do many other hunters that I know. Some type of smokeless muzzleloader has been used in Indiana for 15 years that I know of maybe longer. I can see no good purpose in banning them now.

It is a sad day indeed when "Ugly Politics" show up in proposed hunting regulation changes.

In a very sneaky, underhanded manner, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources has lumped together two completely different issues regarding the use of muzzle-loaded guns for deer.

The proposed change means that if an Indiana (or visiting non-resident) muzzle loading hunter votes "Yes" on the issue presented, in one vote he votes for the legalization of sabot .45 caliber projectiles, while at the same time voting against the use of any muzzleloader that can be loaded and shot with more efficient, cleaner burning, non-corrosive and more economical to shoot smokeless powders. These are two completely different issues!

For those of us who hunt entirely with muzzle loading guns (and we number about 3.5 million nationwide) such regulatory change simply says the InDNR knows absolutely nothing about muzzle loading...or the wants and needs of today's muzzle loading hunter.

I host the No. 1 hunting performance muzzle loading website on the internet. I invite you to go to my site (www.hpmuzzleloading.com) and view the ALERT! I published today regarding the sneaky manner in which your department is trying to slip this one through.

Muzzleloading has evolved and progressed just as all other aspects of firearms and ammunition.

I shoot between 7,000 and 8,000 muzzle loaded rounds a year, and have authored 8 books on muzzleloading. I'm now putting the finishing touches on a new book that will be release this winter/early spring that will be titled "HIGH PERFORMANCE MUZZLELOADING BIG GAME RIFLES".

That is where muzzleloading has gone. Only a small handful of hunters still pursue game with a traditionally styled frontloader...and hunt with reliving history as an honest reason to hunt with a muzzleloader. Today's hunter is out there to extend his or her hunting season, and they want to do it with the most effective rifle and load they can carry.

In the future, I see the control on the number of deer harvested with a muzzleloader done so through limiting the number of permits issued, not by requiring hunters to use a less than optimum load and rifle combination.

Realistically, once you put all of the elements under consideration, nothing is broke that needs fixing. Modern muzzleloaders are an efficient means of humane harvest and no more inherently dangerous than the nut behind the butt. A ban on modern muzzleloaders puts us back in buckskins, no in-lines, etc. Now that isn't a can of worms, it's a hornet's nest or worse.

The rule change to ban smokeless powder in muzzleloader season because of the capability of longer range is ridiculous. Indiana allows the use of centerfire handguns of .243 diameter or larger. The muzzle velocity of the .243 Winchester, .25-06, .260, 7mm-08, .280 and .300 WSM handgun all are over 3000 fps. These handguns have far more range than smokeless powder muzzleloaders are capable of and these guns are legal to harvest deer in Indiana in densely populated areas. The IDNR view of this issue is ludicrous, allowing handguns of faster velocities that are more of a danger to densely populated areas and banning muzzleloaders of lesser velocities and with no more range than the modern shotgun sabot bullet. I highly urge you to allow the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloader season.

Realistically, once you put all of the elements under consideration, nothing is broke that needs fixing. Modern muzzleloaders are an efficient means of humane harvest and no more inherently dangerous than the nut behind the butt. A ban on modern muzzleloaders puts us back in buckskins, no in-lines, etc. Now that isn't a can of worms, it's a hornet's nest or worse.

I am writing regarding the proposed ban on the use of smokeless powder muzzleloaders for deer hunting here in Indiana. I am a graduate of Purdue, an honors graduate of the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy, a Lieutenant on the Madison County Sheriff's Dept., a certified firearms instructor, and a SWAT member/trainer. I am telling you this because I want you to know that I am educated and very familiar with firearms. I have also been hunting since I was 13 years old, about 22 years. I feel that I am qualified to speak about

this issue because I have hunted deer with a muzzleloader for years, and a smokeless muzzleloader since 2000. I also am in a profession where I have had the opportunity to investigate hunting “accidents.”

My smokeless muzzleloader, with the load I hunt with is 40 grains of 5744 with a 250 grain bullet that kills deer very swiftly, and humanely. My best friend shoots 150 grains of triple 7 and the same bullet. Both of our muzzleloaders are sighted in up to 150 yards. Could mine shoot 200, probably. Could his shoot 200, probably. I hunt strictly with my muzzleloader because I value the accuracy and the ability to harvest a deer humanely and limit the number of wounded animals, but what if I hunted with a legal handgun. Lets say I’m shooting a 7mm Magi. in a bull barrel pistol on November 15, 2003, when thousands and thousands of hunters are in the Indiana woods. It is perfectly legal to shoot this pistol utilizing a center-fire rifle cartridge and there is no talk of banning it, that I can see, and no reason to either. I am sure the IDNR would not allow the weapon to be used, especially during the most heavily hunted portion of the Indiana deer season if it was dangerous or had excessive range. But if the proposed ban becomes the rule, I will be unable to hunt with my smokeless rifle, the safest production muzzleloader made. Many of the smokeless powder weapons are only used by hunters during the muzzleloader season, when relatively few hunters are in the woods, because they use an auto-loading shotgun or handgun during firearms season. Which brings me to my next point, excess projectile range contributes to nearly no hunting accidents. I have never investigated a hunting “accident” that occurred because of excess range. Yes, hunting “accidents” occur but they are usually from negligent handling of a firearm. The victim is usually the hunter himself dropping a weapon or pulling a weapon into a tree when it fires due to negligence. Another frequent type of hunting “accident” is when a hunter mistakenly shoots another hunter moving through the woods. These accidents could be long range, but usually aren’t. As you probably know, an archer shot another archer in the leg here in Indiana about three weeks ago. One thing causes “accidents”, and it’s not range of projectile, it is NEGLIGENCE.

I enjoy muzzleloading, modern muzzleloading. I have nothing against primitive type muzzleloaders, I love to go to Friendship and watch the competitors, but I don’t have knowledge to shoot those rifles, and quite frankly, don’t want to clean up black powder rifles, that is the main reason I went to smokeless. The sport of muzzleloading is evolving rapidly. To single out smokeless powder when “black powder substitutes” as they are loosely referred to are competing directly with smokeless and can perform as well, or nearly as well. Five years ago there was pyrodex, now there are many “black powder substitutes” legal in Indiana. Who decides which of these substitutes are legal? If the industry calls them a “black powder substitute” is that good enough? There will be more of these substitutes to come, will they all be legal as long as they smoke, even when they outperform smokeless?

I hope the DNR bans none of the above. Yes, smokeless powder can shoot a bullet a long way, but other legal equipment shoots much further, and during a season when thousands and thousands more hunters are in the woods. If the DNR wants to protect the hunters,

they should put more energy educating hunters on negligent acts that cause injury and death, not ban one of many safe ways to harvest deer.

I would appreciate hearing from you regarding my comments and your response. This is a serious issue, very serious if you work for SMOKELESS MUZZLELOADING INC., a Hartford City area business that will die if this ban goes forward, very serious if you value a safe, clean, way to muzzle load.

I am confused about your comments concerning the use of different cartridges i.e. black powder rifles during the firearms deer season. Your logic seems to be lacking. The reasons for rejection do not agree with past statements and rules your department has put forth.

I attended the hearings on the expansion of the handgun calibers to include .243's +. Stated at the hearing was the reasoning not many would purchase these rifle caliber handguns, when in fact that really opened up the state to the VERY FIREARMS you oppose!! Now the reasons people that spoke against the expansion gave, you use as a reason NOT to expand the base.

The reason that it would require listing legal rounds does not hold, as you disallow the 25-20 and .30 carbine etc as pistol rounds.

I ask that you reconsider the use of black powder cartridge rifles during the gun season. I see no ill effects to the deer herd, population, or hunters by allowing their use. Allow the use of rifles for deer hunting: Rejected: Indiana is a densely populated state. Firearms capable of firing a projectile very long distances create safety problems, especially considering the large number of deer hunters who hunt with a firearm.

Allow use of black powder cartridge rifles for firearms season. Rifles would have to be .38 or larger & over 50 grains of powder. Black powder or substitute only. No smokeless lead bullets. Iron sights, exposed hammers re 1900 or replica. e.g. legal trapdoor, hi-wall, ballard, 1886 Winchesters. Not legal Krag, mausers.

Would like to see antique calibers allowed for deer hunting. Example: Use old 45-70 govt. caliber in a gun like a Remington No. 1 Rolling Block or similar type of firearm.

Add an antique rifle cartridge (e.g. 38-55) deer provision

Rifles for deer hunting during the firearms season: Antique style single shot e.g. falling block, rolling block, tip action, firing cartridges of .40 caliber or larger loaded with an all lead or paper patched bullet loaded with black powder or black powder substitute only. The ballistics would duplicate in-line muzzleloaders and therefore be no more dangerous than them. They would be less powerful and dangerous to the public than pistols firing legal cartridges such as .30/06, .243, etc. Allow high power rifles for deer. It is allowed for coyotes

Seems overly protective to stack permit on permit such as educational permit and rehab and wild animal permit, maybe one permit with endorsement would work.

Prohibiting the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is nonsense. Smokeless powder reduces the variability of the charge and increases accuracy of the shot. Therefore, increasing the likelihood of a clean kill. Why is the rule good for the sport?

If called a muzzleloader, it can be loaded at the muzzle with any powder.

In the right hands, muzzleloaders with smokeless powder are perfectly safe. They do not have any longer range than blackpowder or Pyrodex guns with the new Hornady SST bullets or a legal handgun with a .30 caliber or 270 rifle cartridge. Most animals are shot at 50 yards or less here in Steuben county. Know your limitations, target and background and they are perfectly reliable and safe weapons. Also, it is cheaper to use than blackpowder or substitute.

Support sabots for muzzleloaders. Oppose making the use of smokeless powder illegal. The chief advantage of the smokeless powder muzzleloaders is ease of cleaning, less frequent cleaning, less corrosive.

Agrees with bullet size change. Disagrees with the second part. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. If you allow high power rifle shells to be shot in a pistol, what is the difference.

Especially like the proposal to change the minimum size of the muzzleloader projectiles from .44 caliber to .357 or larger

They are 2 different proposals and should not be lumped together. It's not far to ban smokeless powder muzzleloaders by piggy-backing on smaller bullets for 45 muzzleloaders.

Don't see why it would make a difference if you used smokeless powder or not. I use both.

In most hands, the 45 cal. Is not enough for the deer and the terrain we hunt, let alone .357. .357 sabots are not the answer; marksmanship is!

I believe the change in caliber is viable and wholly acceptable, the restriction on propellant is both difficult to enforce and unnecessarily restrictive. After all, the firearm is still a primitive weapon no matter what projectile/propellant the hunter may choose.

Be more liberal on muzzleloader pistol requirements for deer

unfair to lump two issues together i.e. sabots and smokeless powder. I support the sabots but not the banning of smokeless powder.

totally false. The .45 cal m/l can use the .41 cal. Sabot now available. I submitted a proposal to legalize the now legal flat wall cartridges to be used in single shot rifles, but I don't see that here, but I do see this senseless smokeless m/l rule change. I don't understand. First .410s for deer, now .357 m/l - what happened to quick kills.

as stated, .36 caliber round ball could be used for deer which is too small. Also you might consider that the real intent of the m/l season has been trashed. Why not outlaw in-lines, scopes and all the other non-traditional items that are being used now. Go back to what was the original idea of primitive weapons. Round ball and black powder. It won't happen now that we've looked the other way too long.

The muzzleloader rule is ridiculous, If safety was the real concern why are we using HI power Rifles on fox and coyote, What happens to us guys the already own a smokeless guns.

Sorry, but I think my proposal is more important and relevant than most I have read. I propose all legal handgun caliber's used in harvesting deer should be allowed to be used in their respective long gun calibers, i.e. 44 cal. rifle should be just as legal to harvest deer during the legal season as its handgun counter part. I also believe all caliber handguns using the same ammunition as high power rifles should be stopped. It makes more sense to use a rifle with a cartridge with less range and more accuracy than to use a handgun with a cartridge with much greater range and less accuracy.

smokeless powder for muzzle loading, then u better, stop pistol hunting!!!! some hunter's have asthma !!!!

Not allowing the use of smokeless powder muzzleloaders is the same assaying no crossbows, compound bows, aluminum or carbon arrows! They are still muzzleloaders. The use of Sabots in the in lines are just as dangerous no matter what kind of powder you are using. Also, I thought that if I didn't get an antlered deer any other time, I could take one in the late archery season no matter what kind of bow I'm using.(crossbow or otherwise).

the smokeless powder rule is very out of line considering that Indiana allows the use of handguns chambered in high power rifle loads.

I would like to see the Shotgun season shortened and Muzzleloaders allowed in the first Bow season. Why put the Muzzleloader season toward the end when it is much harder to use a muzzleloader and there is less deer and more skittish deer at this time.

I can't see how smokeless powder muzzleloaders are more dangerous than pistols or other muzzleloaders. Beside they meet all regulation being muzzle loaded and are single shot. There is no reason to ban them.

Smokeless muzzleloaders have been used for many years now in Indiana and have no further range than any modern muzzleloader loaded with a BP substitute. Why would you want to ban smokeless powder muzzleloaders for safety issues when you allow high power center fire handguns capable of 3000+fps?? Smokeless muzzleloaders make up a small percent of Indiana's muzzleloader hunters. I urge you to NOT ban smokeless powder in muzzleloaders!

I realize that I am an out of stator. I am 34 and have been involved with black powder events for more than 25 years. The new inline muzzleloaders are nothing more than high powered rifles that load the bullet at the muzzle. There is nothing of the muzzleloader spirit in these guns. I strongly support your banning of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders, something that we are fighting for here.

Prohibit the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. Muzzleloaders that shoot smokeless powder have the capability of a longer range, which is a public safety concern. I feel that smokeless powder will not increase the range of a muzzleloader enough to matter, but as a long time reloader of brass cased ammo just the thought of using smokeless powder in such a precise manner scares me. I would never consider using modern powders with out exact control over the "combustion chamber", detonations or improper seating just seem to be an easy error to make.

I just purchased a smokeless powder muzzleloader I won't be able to afford another one if you change this law!!! Besides there are plenty of slug guns and pistols that shoot just as far as this muzzle loader.

use sabots & black powder: Strongly Oppose comments: why was this question changed????

I do not believe that smokeless powder in a muzzleloader firearm in any way presents a safety hazard. The reason that I own one is because of the ease of cleaning and care. I also do not believe that we have any reason whatsoever to have a fall turkey season as I believe that it could adversely affect the turkey population that we have been trying hard to achieve.

Please don't ban smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. I have one of these muzzleloaders and I do not think the range with this gun is any longer than other modern muzzleloaders. I have used other muzzleloaders for years, the only difference I have found is easier cleanup when using the smokeless powder.

using smokeless powder dose not endanger anybody.

I believe that banning smokeless powder is not a safety concern when you can use a 30-06 in a 16" barle pistol. Sounds like an attack by traditional black powder shooters.

I was upset to see the question about smokeless powder in a muzzleloader. This type of set up, although enables the hunter to take a 50or 60 yard further shot than other set ups on the market, still only offers one shot. Also the vast majority of hunters using this setup are very experienced, and know when to shot and not to shoot. I feel that putting this law into place would have no positive results on public safety. If a person with this type of setup is a public hazard, well that same person would be a public hazard with any firearm. Its not the gun but the user.

Smokeless powder use in muzzleloaders. Do not permit. If used you have a single shot modern gun. Against the whole idea of muzzleloader hunting.

How can smokeless ML be a safety hazard more than the numerous high-powered handgun cartridges you allow? ML's are single shot & load from the muzzle. Keep that definition only.

Hunters that use smokeless are more apt to be more careful because of being a single shot rifle. Just one shot at a deer. Smokeless MZ's are not your average \$129.00 Wal-Mart special capable of 2300+fps with BP substitute powder. Smokeless guns take more research to shot them successful so the man using them should be more conscience of downrange targets. I fear the young hunter with a 5 shot semi-auto slug gun loaded with modern day sabots going 1900fps shooting at a running deer more than any single shot smokeless muzzleloader. Smokeless powder muzzleloaders are just as safe or safer than some guns that are now legal for deer hunting in Indiana. I strongly urge you not to ban smokeless muzzle loading!

Proposal number 4 does not make good sense. There are a number if Muzzleloaders using black powder or BP substitutes that develop velocities equal to or higher than Muzzleloaders using Smokeless powder. The real advantage of smokeless powder is it's clean non-corrosive properties. Muzzle loading provides a truly "ONE SHOT" hunting experience, like our early Americans. It does not matter what bullet, powder, or primer you are using, you have only one shoot and you had better make it a good one. Is this supposed "increased range" of a muzzleloader using smokeless powder really a safety concern? Is the range of the center fire guns used in the Modern Gun season a safety concern? I believe that proposal 4 serves nothing more than to protect the special interest of muzzleloader manufactures such a Knight, T/C and the rest of the manufactures that currently offer muzzleloaders are NOT designed to use smokeless powder. I do appreciate advancements which allow me to enjoy the "ONE SHOT" hunting experience of muzzle loading without having corrosive components degrading my hunting equipment.

How is the use of a smokeless muzzleloader any different than a 45caliber muzzleloader using 3 pyrodex pellets which boast higher velocities than any of the smokeless guns on the market. The range of the smokeless muzzleloaders is still way below that of most of the.243,7-08,308,300 win mag. hand guns to list a just a few that are legally allowed in this state. And a lot more accurate in the average shooters hands, since it shoulder fired. This is a bad proposal that was not researched thoroughly and should have never have made it this far. If you have any question please contact me. Thank you.

how can you ban smokeless power and not ban black powder substitutes which is smokeless powder

The proposed banning of smokeless powder for muzzleloaders needs to be reworded to fast burning rifle powders, because Pyrodex a black powder equivelent is considered smokeless, but has black powder velocities, they put something in it to make it smoke.

If worried about the range of smokeless powder muzzle loaders, don't eliminate, regulate the charge that can be used. Smokeless powder requires less waste to clean the fire arm and is cleaner burning and is therefore more environmentally friendly.

You are concerned about muzzleloaders using smokeless propellants having longer range then why is no one concerned about the guys toting long range handguns chambered in cartridges such as 30-06

Prohibiting hunters from using smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is unnecessary. The hunters should be allowed to take deer in the most humane method possible. If center fire rifles are not going to be permitted anytime in the future, hunters should be able to use smokeless powder muzzleloaders to assure a safe, quick kill. Which is worse, allowing hunters to use methods which are less accurate, but won't travel as far, or methods which will lead to more bullets in the deer where they belong. Muzzleloader hunters don't expect a second shot, so they're going to make that first one count.

I strongly support #4 but it seems logical that we should also eliminate the use of high-power rifle cartridges in single shot "handguns." Those in .308 or even 30-06 which have a 14 inch barrel and a 3-9x scope and a bipod are rifles. Let's classify them as such.

The proposed ban on smokeless powder in muzzleloaders designed to use this propellant safely is a clear indication to me of the ignorance of the Indiana DNR administration or that possibly some influential individual(s) in the Indiana DNR is(are) on the take from the lobbyists of the industry reps of the companies that are threatened by this advance. All of my muzzleloaders no matter what propellant I use could be a public safety concern no matter the range I chose to discharge them. At longer ranges my smokeless ML is less of a concern than those loaded with black powder or the "fashionable"(i.e. profitable) substitutes because it is more accurate. No matter, all of my muzzleloaders are less of a public safety concern than 5 12 gauge slugs rapidly flying out of a smoothbore barrel at who knows what range. Public safety is obviously entirely out of the hands of any regulatory agency but instead rests with the judgment of the individual no matter the activity. Therefore, either you folks are idiots or on the take big time! My lifetime Indiana license # is 0257, I have hunted deer in Indiana for 35 years, you all are dead wrong and look really real bad on this proposal to the point of stench. I'm betting there are plenty of honest elected state politicians in Indiana who would be willing to check out all of the bureaucratic procedures and internal paperwork associated with this proposal? I for sure will personally follow up on this if this proposal if it proceeds and is adopted.

The "smokeless powder" ban proposal is absurd. Today there is only one, I say again, ONLY ONE, muzzleloader on the market that is capable and marketed for shooting modern smokeless powders, and the is the Savage Model 10ML-II. Even then the velocity is only around 2,300 FPS(feet per second). Heck, Knight (which I am sure, had something to do with this proposal), T/C, CVA, BPI, and a couple of others, have been claiming velocities of 2,400 FPS (in .50 cal) and 2,600 FPS (in .45cal) in their muzzleloaders of at least 2 years now. One muzzleloader manufacture, even though a small one, claims 2,900 FPS and 3,100 FPS! Were is the proposed bans on these muzzleloaders? There aren't any, because this so-called ban on "smokeless powder" as a "public safety issue" is just a bunch of Bravo Sierra, started I am sure by a big-name in the muzzle loading industry like Knight.

Anyone with an elementary understanding of ballistics can see that this proposal is about as useful as a screen door on a submarine and holds about as much water. With 150 grain charges of Hodgdon Pyrodex and Triple Seven powders, 2,200+ FPS is obtainable with 200-250gr bullets without much effort. Guess what though??? Next time you are at your local Wal-Mart or sporting goods store, go buy the hunting/shooting section and pick up a can of Pyrodex and Triple Seven and read the label. You will see that it clearly states on it SMOKELESS PROPELLANT! DAAHHH!!!

Also, let's not get into the issues of modern high performance sabot shotgun loadings and single shot handguns (hand cannons would be a more accurate description). Some modern shotguns load the same type projectiles as the muzzleloaders are. The handguns like, T/C Contenders, Remington XP-100's, Savage Strikers and several others, chambered in anything from .243 Winchester to .300 Weather by Magnums can be used. With 12-14 inch barrels these are outperforming the Savage 10ML-II with smokeless powders. Where is the ban on these???

I strongly oppose the banning of the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. There is only one brand of ML (the Savage) that will even allow this use. I have been doing some comparison of the ballistics of the Savage ML with smokeless powder and other high-performance MLs with black or substitute powder and there is no substantial difference. I do not believe the proposition that it is less safe to have a rifle that shoots faster and farther has been demonstrated to be true in Indiana or any other place. I understand the theory of the bullet traveling further but I haven't heard of problems from this when pistols using high velocity rounds are used. These have been legal in Indiana for some time. In addition it would be unfair to Savage and people who own those muzzleloaders to have a ban placed on just that gun without better proof of there being a problem with its use. This is a bad idea to establish a law to address a problem that has not been shown to even exist. I would actually propose that the laws be modified to allow some limited use of rifles in certain calibers for deer hunting. Some calibers would have similar performance to the pistol calibers legal now and the muzzleloader performance that is now possible with modern guns.

Who do you keep changing the wording on this proposal? And why does it come up as "Sabots & Black Powder" when a vote is cast? Whatever happened to the proposal to legalize sabots for .45 rifles? Which I am against. Too many light bullets for poor performance on deer. Also, too many discrepancies in how this poll is being conducted. In court, it would prove invalid. And that is exactly where this issue is headed.

Muzzleloaders should use only black powder or a substitute as they are meant to be primitive fire-arms. Those using smokeless powder should be classified as center fire. Smokeless powder in a muzzleloader retracts from the purpose of using a muzzleloader in the first place — it's a method of hunting to get the most out of the experience. As far as I am concerned, muzzle loading should be limited to flintlocks or cap locks and scopes should not be allowed. After all, we take up muzzle loading to test our hunting ability, not the ability to kill at longer range.

The proposed ban on smokeless powder for muzzleloaders has no meaning. The new style shotgun slugs and the different cartridges that are approved for handgun are far more potential of a safety concern. There are MANY less muzzleloader hunters that firearm season hunters, and most of the muzzleloader hunters are far more responsible. If you truly has a safety concern, make hunter education MANDATORY for ALL, I know many older hunters who are unsafe in the field. Whoever made this proposal obviously known nothing about ballistics, terminal velocity, or trajectory. To sum it up, what you are considering is considerably less dangerous than what YOU already allow!!!

I live in Michigan and hunt whitetail in Indiana during muzzleloader season. I use a smokeless powder muzzleloader. If you ban smokeless powder I will no longer come to Indiana during the muzzleloader season. Usually my stay is a week and I spent several hundred dollars. That will be money Indiana retailers will lose.

For the proposed ban on Smokeless powder in Muzzle loaders, I do not think this should happen. I have read the DNR comments on the extended range and safety concerns and agree that there is more of a concern, but Indiana already allows the use of handguns that have even more range than the muzzle loaders using smokeless powder. As always, all fire arms and bows can be dangerous, but we must take steps to educate the people who will be using them on how to use them safely.

Smokeless powder ml rifles do not have increased range over 150 gr.pyrodex/777 loaded rifles. I have chronographed my savage ml10 with three smokeless powders and pyrodex and h777 powder and have seen a max velocity difference of approx. 100 fps. this with a 250 gr sabot bullet. The ballistic difference is nil. run any ballistic program to verify this. the only advantage of smokeless is the ease of cleaning. Please give me your actual data to show a long range advantage to smokeless .

I am not a resident of your state, However, I do intend to hunt it...,Therefore, it would be in my best interest to be aware of any change to policy. The no smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is restrictive, especially for those who own a Savage muzzleloader.

Banning smokeless powder in muzzle loading rifles will not adequately address your concerns re' public safety if these concerns are based on long range capabilities. Many modern, in-line muzzleloaders are available today that can generate remarkable velocities with fairly light bullets. No matter what type of powder is used, the salient point is the velocity of the bullet as well as its mass. To target smokeless powder as the culprit is short sighted. Further, there is no reasonable means to enforce a smokeless powder ban since hunters can carry spare loads of any powder to present to CO's upon request. Thus, my gun can contain smokeless powder, but my pocket contain Pyrodex pellets. Pulling the bullet to check the powder is possible, but not feasible in the field. I urge you to drop this pointless ban and focus on hunter education and responsibility if you feel public safety is at risk. Lastly, if indeed public safety is at risk from smokeless powder, where do you draw the line? Is it a 100yd weapon, a 150yd weapon, etc. Modern shotguns with modern slugs are pushing the range issue further and further, you run the risk of anti-hunting elements using your own language as a means to request other modern weapons be banned for public

safety concerns. What a huge mistake you are making, in my opinion, and thank you for letting me express it.

I very strongly oppose the smokeless powder ban proposal. The reason that you give is not a valid reason. There are manufacturers of non-smokeless powder burning muzzle loaders that advertise their rifles as being the fastest and having the longest range. You say that smokeless powder has a capability of a longer range, but that is NOT what the manufacturers claim. Also, if your concerns are the distance that the projectile will travel, which projectile will travel farther, one from a smokeless powder burning muzzle loader or one from a .30-06 chambered single shot pistol?

You changed the item related to smokeless powder in muzzle loaders on your web page, just when we were encouraging all our teachers to use this page as the example of governmental abuse of power, by slipping a undesirable item in with a desirable item. Shame on you. You ruined a perfect civics lesson. Your argument still is flawed as one student pointed out his legally used pistol, exceeds both the velocity and distance of the Savage muzzle loader with smokeless powder. So it seems that you are either mislead, deceiving the public or outright telling less than the truth. Please clarify which of these it is so we can inform our students, rather than letting them think the worst of their government. Oh the calculations on the pistol were checked by a physics student and professor at the University of Evansville to be sure we had our figures correct. You sir have really created a lot of negative feelings toward the DNR. Leave the issue of what powder in a muzzle loader up to the individual.

It is my understanding that you can use handguns that are chambered for rifle cartridges such as Thompson Encore in a .308 Win. If your banning smokeless because of public safety than how can you still allow rifle cartridges in handguns? I know I don't live in your state but the ban would definitely influence my decision to take a hunting trip here.

If you purchase a "smokeless Powder muzzleloader prior to the rule change & have the invoice or sales receipt w should be able to have that firearm "grandfathered in" It is very disappointing to call your Bloomington office and be told that smokeless muzzleloaders & electronic deer calls are legal and end up wasting \$650.00 of my hard earned money.

Changing rules to Muzzle loading at this point may cause a loss of investments in equipment purchases. Not knowing the reasons behind wanting to ban electronic deer calls, I reserve my opinion. Changing check in times and regulations would be a nice (less stressful) policy.

The idea of banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is ludicrous. The idea that changing from black powder or a black powder substitute to smokeless somehow makes firearms inherently more dangerous just isn't true. In addition, I would submit that it borders on coercive to include a statement at the end of the survey question that presupposes range and safety issues. By the way, have you looked at a bottle of Pyrodex lately? It says right on the bottle "Smokeless black-powder substitute". Are you proposing we outlaw the nation's most popular muzzle loading propellant? Please take the time to do

your homework on the true nature of smokeless powder muzzle loading. Not only are your suppositions unfounded, but you are opening yourself up to a discrimination lawsuit if you choose to outlaw smokeless powder for use in muzzleloaders. I would also like to add that ANY firearm improperly used can be a deadly weapon. Is it realistic to think that the slug from a .44 caliber revolver or 12 ga. slug-gun is going to do any LESS damage at a distance than a smokeless powder muzzleloader? In fact, one could easily make the argument that the person/hunter who goes out and takes the time to research and learn how to use a smokeless powder muzzleloader will almost surely be a better educated, more knowledgeable hunter than one who just goes out and buys the cheapest muzzleloader he can so he can extend his hunting season. The extra time and effort a hunter needs to invest in learning his equipment when he chooses a smokeless powder muzzleloader virtually guarantees a more serious, conscientious hunter. I would love the opportunity to discuss this issue with the DNR and I will even volunteer my expertise as a smokeless powder muzzleloader expert for Savage Arms to anyone with your department that would like to learn more.

I have seen 45. cal. muzzleloaders advertised to shoot flatter and faster than my smokeless muzzleloader. Looks to me like someone is trying to outlaw the competition.

On the smokeless powder ban. There are few smokeless powders suitable for specialized muzzle-loaders. The extra range provided is not that much better than current in-line muzzleloaders, Many legal handguns like 7mm-08, and some of the specialized shotgun sabot loads now available to hunters and legal in Indiana. We are missing the point here. People need to look at their hunting spot and decide which weapons are safe for the situation. Bow and arrow where a house is on the other side of a small woods or near a busy highway or the edge of town. A short range handgun might be used in rural areas where houses are scattered but not close together. Shotgun slugs and muzzle-loaders where houses are few and widely dispersed. Long range ammo, muzzle-loaders and handguns in densely forested areas where there are few or no houses for miles. Better hunter education on weapon selection is what we really need here. Otherwise we are headed toward a long argument as to which individual brand of ammo, powder, bullet is legal or illegal. I remember the days of the round ball and the conical bullet in muzzleloaders. A lot of people were not able to find their game and went out to shoot another. More modern muzzleloaders have resulted in better game recovery rates without increasing the actual number of deer killed.

The present rules allow the use of a handgun chambered for anything from .357 to .460 Weather by and beyond. If you compare the ballistics of a handgun and a rifle chambered for the same cartridge, I think you will find very little difference. The Savage ML 10 loaded with 150grains of Pyrodex with a 300 grain bullet is very, very, very, close to 48 grains of Alliant Reloader 7 with a 300 grain bullet, ballistic ally. This information was obtained from the owners manual for a Savage ML 10. The thought that a handgun chambered for a high powered rifle cartridge does not have long range danger, public safety, I think is a false sense of security. I hope the people proposing this rule change are educated in the use of and ballistics of firearms, if not they should be. Also I hope this rule change isn't proposed by some group of traditionalists under the guise of safety. Thank You!

Deer #4, Smokeless powder generates a higher velocity, thereby increasing the energy delivered to the game. This could result in faster, cleaner kills. I feel that this is a more humane and sportsmanlike way to harvest game animals. As hunters, it is our obligation to harvest game quickly, cleanly, and with utmost respect for that game animal.

Muzzle loading proposals should not have been lumped together

Regarding smokeless powder. Smokeless powder muzzleloaders have no more range (+ or -60 yds) than "black powder substitutes" They definitely don't have as much range as say a 7 mm mag cartridge fired from a hand gun during firearms season when there are tens of thousands of Indiana hunters in our woods. Every year there are "black powder substitutes" entering the market, that are of nearly the same chemical composition as smokeless – yet they are fine? But my smokeless gun shooting 2200 or 2300 FPS with my hunting load soon to be illegal? And I also regret that you wrote your survey questions the way you did. First it was clearly problematic with two different issues pitted against each other now, you are using a leading question to skew the results in one direction. Let's face it, if the DNR wanted to avoid a "safety concern" from "long range" projectiles, wouldn't banning these high-power rifle rounds fired out of mini rifles (handguns) during the season when fifty times more hunters are walking the woods make more sense. Don't get me wrong, I am not banning any effective weapon, pistols are fine. Hunters cause accidents not weapons. I heard of a bow hunter shooting another bow hunter a week or two ago. There will always be negligent acts taking place, punishing responsible hunters will not take them away.

I believe that the use of smokeless powder muzzleloaders should continue to be allowed. Users of these types of guns are generally highly skilled and spend a lot of time with knowing and using their equipment, therefore, I do not believe that the additional range is a hazard. Furthermore, their use should continue to be allowed during the muzzleloader season as they are still only contain one opportunity to fire the gun.

Please make up your mind how you want to word the proposed ban on smokeless powder...so all of us who are against such legislation will know how to fight it. And if it is a fight you want, it will be a fight you get. Does this also mean that Pyrodex and Triple Seven will be banned? They are not black powder...and are officially classified as a flammable solid, the same as smokeless powder. In fact, I have several cans of Pyrodex here that clearly state "Smokeless Propellant" right on the side of the container.

Why ban smokeless powder muzzleloaders and allow pistols with 16 inch barrels that shoot high power rifle rounds such as 30-06 or 300winchester mag.

I don't like the proposal of smokeless power it is easier to use you can see after a shot if you hit your shot better then looking at smoke you could put in a big charge of black power and shoot a long ways to.

With all the other pistols/rifles and shotguns with high capacity to hold a lot of slugs that travel at over 2000 fps. I cannot believe that safety is on your minds. I think a big 45 cal. producer has made a big contribution to someone.

The range of the smokeless powder muzzleloaders is not any more extended than some of the new high velocity shotgun slugs. With many new in-line black powder muzzleloaders increased barrel lengths and improved propellants and ballistics of sabot bullets, there performance can be as effective as many mid-caliber center fire rifles. I don't feel the smokeless muzzleloaders are any more of a danger to the general public or property than many of the other weapons held as "safe". Seems like a baseless proposal.

I strongly believe question 4 should have been broken into two questions due to the fact that many people are for the .357 sized bullets and may not oppose the use of smokeless powder muzzleloaders. I for example use a smokeless powder muzzleloader and am for a smaller size bullet but am forced to vote against this because the muzzleloader I use.

I feel strongly that smokeless powder should be legal. Are you aware of the muzzleloaders that can shoot 150 and 200 grain charges of Pyrodex with velocities over 2200 FPS? If smokeless isn't allowed then a load limit needs to be applied to pyrodex or black powder guns.

The proposed ban on smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is a prime example of blatant ignorance on the part of the Indiana DNR.

No.4 is good except for banning smokeless powder. Smokeless powder is GOOD and SAFE for hunting. Don't knock it if you haven't tried it. It may not be for everyone but those use it are sold on it's value for quality hunting. I strongly encourage you to learn more about it from those that support it's use. I won't hunt states that don't allow it.

Regarding #4. I agree with the sabot rule, but disagree strongly with the prohibition of smokeless powder. Many hunters have been using smokeless powder safely and effectively for several years. It is more economical, easier for a working person to maintain his/her weapon(non-corrosive), and humanely takes deer. Many of these smokeless loads put out much more energy with similar range of a black powder, thus the only advantage in killing the deer is in the speed of kill by imparting greater energy on the target. Pyrodex, I would assume, will still be legal. Pyrodex is not any more a "black powder" than smokeless. I would like to understand the basis of the rule change. I would think that our Dept of Natural Resources would like to limit the number of wounded animals and continue to allow fair chase. I have been shooting smokeless and "black powder" pyrodex for years. I would be glad to demonstrate that differences to anyone interested. I am deeply saddened by this, I can not see how smokeless shooters are doing any harm to the state or the deer herd we love. I would greatly appreciate a reply. Thank you for your time.

The muzzle loading proposals should have been separate issues!

smokeless muzzleloader's still are muzzleloader's. The smokeless power gives more energy foot lb's. or killing power for a sure kill.

I think the proposal to not allow the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders is a terrible idea. Smokeless powder should be allowed to be used by muzzleloaders.

I don't think smokeless powder should be banned for Muzzleloaders.

Smokeless powder for muzzleloaders should not be banned

I feel that the proposal for muzzle loading is only partially right. I feel that the reduction in allowable caliber to be correct, but the prohibition of smokeless powder is wrong. If the department wants to keep the muzzle loading season "primitive", then they should also prohibit in-lines altogether or at least outlaw any other sights other than iron sights (no optics). What is the rationale for the prohibition of smokeless powder for a muzzle loader??

I am the author of nine books on muzzle loading and the host of the HIGH PERFORMANCE MUZZLELOADING website (www.hpmuzzleloading.com). My question to you is...what's the hang up of shooting smokeless powder in a muzzleloader...provided the muzzleloader has been built to handle smokeless powder? There is absolutely nothing "traditional" about any modern in-line rifle that's loaded with a modern black powder substitute (and Pyrodex has been legally classified as a "smokeless propellant") and a plastic sabot or skirted bullet. With loads of "Triple Seven" (a black powder substitute) companies such as Knight and Thompson/Center Arms are already touting 2,400 f.p.s. velocities with some .45 caliber rifle loads. The typical velocity shot with a "smokeless load" out of the Savage Model 10ML II "smokeless muzzleloader" is under 2,300 f.p.s. So, just what is it you are trying to accomplish by prohibiting smokeless loads in this rifle?

The consumer clearly loves shooting smokeless powder in the Savage muzzleloader. It gives more consistent velocities, more consistent accuracy, far less recoil and is much more economical to shoot than the so-called "black powder substitutes". And, what's in those powders...do you really even know or are you just accepting that they're basically the same as black powder?

I have gotten velocities well over 2,200 f.p.s. with a heavy load of FFFg Triple Seven out of the Savage Model 10ML II. That's not possible with black powder or even Pyrodex...so what makes Triple Seven so hot? It is not a black powder substitute if it creates enough pressure to give smokeless velocities.

The Indiana DNR is opening a can of worms they don't want to tackle. The minute your regulations go into effect outlawing the use of smokeless powders in the Model 10ML II, I know of a number of those rifle owners who are not only ready but willing to slap your department with a discrimination lawsuit.

DO NOT prohibit the use of smokeless powder in a muzzleloader.

Question #4 is clearly an attempt to outlaw the Savage 10-ML in your state. With no biological reasons to consider I can't understand this. Would Indiana ban the Winchester model 70 if the majority of hunters preferred the Remington 700? Really, a lot of deer and other game are wounded and lost because many muzzle loaders don't shoot hard enough for humane kills unless the shooter is really disciplined. So why is a better rifle wrong? If Knight or TC gets their guns to shoot as good as the 10-ML will you ban them also?

I shoot a Pyrodex rifle. My brother shoots a smokeless rifle. With my 3 Pyrodex pellets and a 250 grain sst we can both hit a 6" target consistently at 200 yards. Why is there talk of banning smokeless? Yet Pyrodex is okay. I'm not sure on the motivation to take this action, but it certainly is not fair to the many Indiana hunters who have been shooting smokeless. The smokeless only has one major advantage – Ease of cleaning the rifle – and that's not hurting Indiana. Kentucky tried the same thing and they did extensive research and realized that it just didn't make sense. I currently shoot a t/c omega but after seeing that smokeless shoots as well that you don't have the clean up hassle I planned on buying one. I guess that will be another \$500 the Indiana economy won't get if the smokeless is banned.

With proposal #4 I am against banning smokeless powders when used in muzzle-loading rifles designed for it (Savage, SMI [which are made in Indiana]). I own one of these muzzleloaders and while there is as light performance gain it is much cleaner to shoot. It almost sounds like a certain muzzleloader manufacture is behind this rule proposal. If you want to have a more gravitational muzzleloader season then make a separate one. I am a hunter and use the best weapon and tactics I can for a clean and humane kill. The proposal to allow .357 sabot projectiles from .45 caliber muzzleloaders is OK but these should be shot from hi-performance muzzle-loading rifles to insure clean kills. I feel very strongly on this subject and will watch this. I am a non-resident landowner and use my land for hunting and nature conservation.

There are already plenty of good bullets to use in a .50 cal muzzle-loader that are legal with the current law. Smokeless powder should not be outlawed in muzzle loaders, because that would exclude the users of Savage muzzle-loaders that were built to shoot smokeless.

Smokeless powder muzzle loaders(easy to clean)& Electronic deer calls have not been demonstrated to have a significant impact on Indiana's deer herd. I feel the smokeless powder prohibition is a separate issue from the .357 bullets.

Smokeless is a black powder substitute.

Do not ban smokeless powder in muzzleloaders

I strongly oppose the banning of the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. Although a rationale for the other proposals is offered, no rationale is offered for this proposal. Also, the ban on smokeless is linked to a totally unrelated matter-the use of .357 sabot projectiles in .45 caliber muzzleloaders. Those are two unrelated issues and I do not understand why they are linked. The impression is given that the intent is to ban the Savage

muzzleloader by linking the smokeless issue with an issue that is likely to achieve widespread support (the use of sabot projectiles in .45 caliber muzzleloaders). If there is an interest on the part of DNR in banning the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders, then why not simply submit that proposal to the public and offer the Department's rationale in doing so? Please feel free to contact me at either my mailing address or e-mail address.

Regarding #4. I have no problem allowing .357 bullets. I do oppose, very strongly the ban on smokeless powder. I shoot a t/c encore with 3 Pyrodex pellets. My brother shoots a smokeless with the exact same bullet. We both shoot accurately up to 200 yards. Why ban the smokeless, and not Pyrodex. Pyrodex is not anything like black powder. I was planning on buying a smokeless for the main reason everyone I know is –ease of cleaning. I am interested in knowing why the smokeless ban. Does the DNR think they shoot too fast? But in the same proposal allow 357 bullets. The only reason anyone wants to lessen knockdown power by shooting this small of a bullet is to shoot a faster round. This is ok, but ban smokeless? In all fairness these should have been two separate issues. Everyone is going to vote strongly support the .357 bullet. Rightfully so. But at the same time they are voting to ban smokeless. These are two different issues and need to be addressed that way. When you vote for the .357 you vote for a faster round, and strike down the smokeless at the same time. The only smokeless M.L. that is mass produced is my savage. It had been tested to a chamber pressure of 140,000. It is the safest muzzleloader EVER! I was told that the DNR is being lobbied by Knight rifles and Thompson center, in an attempt to keep savage from taking market share. I love my Thompson Center Black Powder gun, but smokeless is safe, effective, humane and easy to maintain. If this ban is carried, then rightfully Pyrodex should be banned also, which also would make no sense. If this is to go forward the DNR should at least separate the two distinctly different issues to be statistically fair and accurate. Thank you

Do not ban smokeless powder for muzzleloaders.

I am strongly opposed to the restriction of the use of smokeless gunpowder during the deer muzzle loading season. Why are you doing this? What is the reason? As a female shooter and hunter I enjoy the use of smokeless powder and the easy clean up after. I purchased the Savage rifle especially for the ease of operation and ease of clean up afterward. Are you anti female hunter? Do you like the smell of black powder in your house? I'm so concerned of your lack of understand of female hunters that I have ask to be put on the agenda for our next gun club meeting. I'm also contacting the NRA women's issues and see if they find what you are doing as objectionable as I do. I ask that you leave muzzle loading season just as it is, a muzzle loading season, let each individual load the powder of their choice.

I strongly oppose the banning of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders.

Rule #4 In regard to the use of smokeless powder it is placed in the muzzleloader the same as black powder and only allows one shot the same as black powder it does not endanger anyone by shooting great distances and will not adversely effect the deer herd. It does make

it easier for the hunter to keep his muzzleloader clean and does not foul the environment as much as black powder. I would like to hear the reason for banning smokeless powder.

Question 4 should be separated as two different questions. They are separate issues.

I do not support proposal # 4. While the caliber change would be supported, the powder restriction is not.

We need to allow use of Triple 7 powder for muzzleloaders. This is a proven safe/cleaner burning method of powder!

I strongly OPPOSE banning muzzleloaders which use smokeless powder from hunting. The use of smokeless powder does NOT increase the chances of taking a deer. I own such a muzzleloader and the main reason I bought it was for ease of cleaning. Black powder and its substitutes burn dirty and are quite messy to clean. Smokeless powders burn clean like a normal firearm would. Other benefits of smokeless powder are that less powder is used per load (approx. 44 grains used) and obviously no smoke is generated upon firing. I have no problem with lowering the minimum bullet diameter for sabot rounds to .357", as this only legalizes what is already legal for deer hunting in a handgun. Again, smokeless powder offers NO advantage as far as the taking of deer is concerned. Thanks.

To outlaw smokeless powder in muzzleloaders you are ruling against cleaner kills - less wounding loss. If you allow pyrodex, suggest you look at a box of pellets, It says "Smokeless Powder Propellant." Allowing only black powder is a step backward against today's progressing muzzleloader development. Why don't you also outlaw compound bows as a parallel to the muzzleloader proposal.

I am totally opposed to banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders.

muzzleloading issues should have been separated. I oppose banning smokeless powder .

What's the difference between black powder subs and smokeless? Aren't they both black powder subs?

Please do not prohibit smokeless powder in muzzleloaders.

I strongly oppose the restriction on the use of smokeless powder in the muzzle loading deer season. No evidence exists that would indicate that such a restriction is needed or would have any beneficial effects on the deer herd or safety of the human population. This is an unwanted and unneeded restriction. It also would be difficult to enforce bring into the question what is smokeless powder? As a retired public school administrator a lifetime hunting license holder and board member of Red Brush Rifle club I can tell you this is not something that is in the best interest of either the deer herd or the sporting/shooting public. Vote no on this one. If you want me to get our 550 + membership to back me on this just say so.

Pick a center fire rifle to make legal for deer gun season, just make model and size, for instance-marlin lever action 30-30 or a lever action .44 or even a .444 this would be more effective and would not be hard to check in the field and or enforce. Plus the state would retain some hunters that go to other states like Kentucky, because they want to hunt with a rifle.

The Department's opposition to the use of high-powered rifles to hunt deer is irrational. Example: a .243 pistol with an 18" barrel is legal, but a .243 rifle with a 22" barrel is not, although they fire the same ammunition at very nearly the same muzzle velocity. If anything, the rifle is the safer of the two, because it's more accurate. Yet it's illegal.

I don't think the muzzleloader proposals should have been lumped together. The issues of sabots and smokeless powder are very different.

Do NOT ban smokeless powder in muzzleloaders.

On question #4 this should be 2 question it not right to put these 2question in one

I could not be more opposed to banning smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. I am totally opposed to the ban.

I like to be able to use smokeless powder in my muzzle loader if it is made to use it. I would support the rest of number four.

The government should not be involved in the decision of what legally purchased powder, I decide to put in my gun. The passing of this proposal will make me think twice of coming to Indiana for any hunting or fishing trips in the future. Please do not pass this restriction on my muzzle loading hunting preferences as referred to in question4.

In regards to proposal #4, since I was one of two persons that proposed a part of it: I strongly agree with .357 caliber or larger projectiles for muzzleloaders. However I VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE with not being able to use smokeless powder in a muzzleloader which is capable of doing so! I own one. The reason I own one is that clean up of the weapon is much easier than with black powder. Otherwise, I would not even own a muzzleloader. Thank you for your time and do not adopt this rule if it disallows the use of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders.

Smokeless powder is a black powder substitute.

Strongly support a muzzleloader season during early archery season, please reconsider

I strongly support the use of smokeless powder, and it is no more a safety concern than Pyrodex. Anything loaded from the muzzle is a muzzle-loader. I strongly oppose sabots and black powder use.

No. 4 - The use of any type propellant and ignition for muzzleloaders should be allowed. If it loads from the front, you get only one shot, and that shot can be ignited from a flintlock,

caplock, inline percussion with caps or primers, and powder in any form or type. I like the idea of adding the .357 cal. description for a sabboted bullet.

on muzzleloaders: they are as accurate as a center fire rifle.

I strongly agree with the following proposal. I wanted to suggest this myself but didn't think it would be considered. The .357 sabot in the muzzleloader is very capable and more than adequate from what I have read of harvesting deer. I hope this change passes.

4. Allow the use of saboted bullets for muzzleloaders Accepted: Deer can be humanely taken with saboted bullets of .357inch diameter and the Division of Fish and Wildlife is proposing to make this change.

While I agree with the minimum bore size of .44 caliber, there is a wide and very quality selection of abated bullets suited for deer which are smaller in diameter. These can be fired from the .45,50,and.54 cal. rifles at very good velocities and accuracy. There are many to choose from, yet many hunters won't purchase these smaller bullets simply because there isn't much practical purpose to do so.

Changing this law would give hunters a wider variety of choices and maybe help the economy. No, I'm not a salesman of black powder accessories. I'm a hunter who would like to see this small change in rules. The state of Indiana may even sell a few more muzzleloader permits.

Change bullet size in 45 cal. Muzzleloader rifles, from .44 or larger to at least .357 to utilize the newer technology of modern pistol bullets and sabots. A person who favors .45 cal. rifle is handicapped and not able to utilize the capabilities of the rifle.

on question number 4 , first of all they don't make a muzzle loader that is a 45 caliber that uses smokeless powder only in a 50 caliber. I do believe we should have the use of smokeless powder in a muzzleloader providing the muzzle loader is capable of using such powder ,there is only one manufacturer that produces this type of muzzleloader and it comes in the 50 cal. only. that question number 4counterdics on what it is saying . if the state or the people are concerned of what the range is on this type of muzzle loader it is the same as any other black powder muzzleloader can give. which is around180 yards to 225 yards. the best advantages to using smokeless powder are a couple that I can think of , one is the cleanness of how it burns and does not corrode the barrel of your muzzle loader. 2 , by not having it foul up in your barrel it gives the hunter a better opportunities to get off a better and more accurate second shot if needed ,

I think allowing rifles in .357 and .44 mag for deer hunting would be desirable and not a safety issue due to their short range.

Another example is Muzzleloader restrictions which are just another harassment program. Who cares what kind of powder is used as long as it's loaded from the muzzle. I use Pyrodex myself, but why should I tell the next guy he should do as I do? That's ridiculous and an unnecessary invasion of his freedom of choice. I can understand caliber size

because some folks don't understand ballistics and it's effect on humane kills, but why restrict the type of powder — dumb. Also why restrict the type of sights on the muzzleloader - because of some purist mountain man complex? Let the guy choose whatever sight he wants, it's still a muzzleloader. Maybe he shoots more accurately with a scope, is that more humane? So, let him/her choose what works best for them. Also why restrict the way the muzzleloader is designed to make using the weapon a little more enjoyable because it's easier to clean, etc., it's still a muzzleloader. These types of laws (permits) are unnecessary and take away our freedoms of choice. This is the very essence of the Bill of Rights in our Constitution =freedom of choice unless it endangers someone else or it infringes on the other person's freedoms of choice. This principle should be applied to every decision before instituting a new restriction(law/permit) on our citizens.

I would be very disappointed to see the use of smokeless powder made unlawful. I do appreciate this site and the opportunity to voice my opinion. 4

You bring up the longer ranges that the "smokeless powders" have, what about the range of the new handgun that I use for deer hunting? It is the new 50 cal! I think it will shoot just as far as a long gun but not as accurate

Finally the truth comes out. The extended range issue about smokeless powder use in muzzleloaders, was just bullpoo and chicken poo way of trying to fool the muzzleloader hunters of IN. SHAME ON YOU!!!!!!! You ought to resign in disgrace, but since when do dishonest people do the right thing anyway.

I am writing about the banning of smokeless powder in muzzleloaders. I purchased a muzzleloader that is rated for smokeless powder. I did so for the ease of cleaning/maintenance. To my knowledge Savage is the only muzzleloader capable of using smokeless powder. Is there too much heat from other muzzleloader brands? With the new designs and extended range of these muzzleloaders, are they any more of a hazard and should be banned? I strictly follow the company guidelines on my loads and don't see how it is any more dangerous to the public than any other gun.

Deer #4 Myself, and several other hunters have purchased these muzzleloaders for the ease of cleaning. There are load restraints on these rifles by the manufacturer. It may be possible to load other muzzle loading rifles with more than 100 grains by volume and produce more velocity than this rifle. I also hunt with a handgun and do exceed the velocities. Please reconsider these changes to the laws in Indiana. Thank you for your consideration. 4

I like many other hunters believe that a muzzleloader is a muzzleloader no matter what type of powder is being used. If something is not causing harm why change it. This just takes up the time of our elected officials that have other thing to worry about. 4

To eliminate smokeless powder in a muzzleloader is to undermine the powder industry, Think about the use of pistols during firearm season, the use of a 308 caliber pistol that is capable of shooting one inch groups at 300 yards is okay to hunt with, Why not use a high powered rifle in firearms season. You tell me what the difference would be other than one

gun is longer than the other and I'll show you the groups on paper to prove it gladly. To propose to do away with smokeless powder is insane at the least. Drop it and move on. 4

Re: Proposal 4. The public safety argument is nonsense as lawful handguns for deer hunting have greater projectile range than the smokeless powder muzzleloaders. If projectile range is the issue, identify all weapons with range beyond x, and outlaw them. Otherwise your proposed regulation has a false "public safety" motive. Has anyone been injured or killed at long range by one of these muzzleloaders? Your "smokeless powder" issue is also nearly unenforceable. Please do not implement this regulation. 4

I regard hi-tech muzzleloaders (in-lines, plastic sabots and smokeless powders) as cheating and not in the spirit of the original intention of the muzzle-loading deer season. I would prefer that the special muzzleloader season were open to any legal firearm. 4

Do not prohibit the use of smokeless powder in muzzle-loading rifles on private property. I know where the people are on my farm, and the distance to the other farms around me. If you don't want it on state properties that's fine, but please don't try to outlaw the use of smokeless powder on private lands. I can spend more time with my wife talking about our day in the field if I'm not standing at the sink scrubbing out our guns thank you. 4

I would like to make a comment on one of the rule changes that I STRONGLY oppose. That would be the one that would not allow the use of smokeless powder in a muzzleloader. I think that the reasons given are out of line. The new inline muzzleloaders that use 150 gr of black powder have the same range as the ones that shoot smokeless. As you know the muzzleloader is still a single shot weapon just like the handguns and there are several of the handguns that are allowed that have a much greater range than any muzzleloader. Also this is like telling an archery hunter that he could only use a long bow and not a compound with carbon arrows!!! 4

Allow the use of smokeless powder only in the extreme southern counties where the hills would be a safe backstop. 4

I feel very oppose to #4. Hunters have bought equipment to use smokeless powders. There are pistols that use rifle round that have longer ranges. Has there been any problem so far? 4

Reference to the black powder gun season, go traditional, open hammer and black powder or pyrodex only for ignition, patch and round ball. This is not only safer, but it makes it a lot easier for the law division to identify the firearm at a distance and because the new in-lines look like modern firearms. And last the in-lines are listed as shooting modern rounds IE: pistol or other bullets and the distance they travel, a round ball hits something, it loses its energy; and a modern bullet is encased in copper etc. and when hits something and ricochet they do not lose much energy and could travel a long distance causing other problems. I am a Hunter Safety Course Instructor. 4

With respect to deer hunting rule #4, the primary benefit of using a smokeless powder is less corrosion to the barrel. The pressure limits are still limited by the quality of steel used in the barrel. As far as a public safety issue for the extended range, that is a totally unfounded accusation. Shotguns, and their slugs have the ability to reach just as far as any muzzleloader built today, including the new Savage smokeless model. Not only that, but the general shape (short and fat) of shotgun slugs make them more likely to become airborne again if they strike the ground, thus greatly increasing the risk to others in the area. 4

I would recommend that the rules be modified for what kinds of sabot projectiles are allowed to be used. I would recommend that the diameter restriction be reduced to .375", but that a bullet weight restriction of 180 grains be added. This would allow the use of 357 and 40 caliber bullets that are designed for hunting purposes, and are capable of taking game more efficiently than the traditional 44 cal. round ball and patch. The 44 cal ball and patch load weighs only 135 grains and is capable of very high velocities, however their accuracy's very limited which has resulted in a lot of wounded game over the years. These smaller projectiles still weigh more than the 44 cal. ball and patch (by quite a bit), and are more limited in their velocity than the ball and patch. At the same time the smaller projectiles are more well suited to cleanly harvesting wild game than the ball and patch, and are capable of better accuracy, again resulting in less wounded game in the field. The net result would be more effective projectiles without extending the range of the weapons.

On proposal 4 the state presently allows handgun hunting and many of these handguns are nothing more than a hand held rifle with short barrel. So why penalize a muzzleloader hunter because they have a rifle that shoots smokeless powder. I don't think there are enough of them out there to worry about and they probably won't shoot any farther than several of the handguns available or a muzzleloader that shoots 150 grains of black powder with a sabot. I also wonder what the average distance deer are shot at in Indiana and I don't think these smokeless powder muzzleloaders will increase that average.

6. Allow the taking of a buck under the one buck rule during the crossbow season. Since hunters are allowed only one buck during the year, this should not have any negative effect on the deer herd.

Think about placing crossbow in with the gun season instead of late bow season because it has a trigger. Thank you

Please do not discriminate against crossbow hunters.

Please do not make the rules for crossbows any more liberal. These weapons should be illegal except for the handicapped or elderly.

crossbows should not be allowed at all except for handicapped people or in gun season only. Should be no special season; bucks could be taken in gun season with a crossbow.

this rule was adopted to help control the doe population while giving hunters more opportunity. The one buck rule was adopted to strengthen quality buck deer to the

population. The rule should stand as is. Opening this up to allow for antlered deer may also cause an influx of crossbow hunters therefore increasing the kill ratio and negating the purpose of the one buck rule. This crossbow season was debated heavily during the proposal stages and was supported by many outdoorsmen including myself as an antlerless deer only option to help in the management of Indiana's deer herd. Give the one buck rule title to advance the quality of Indiana's deer herd.

this doesn't make sense. One buck is one buck.

only if the one buck rule is permanent rule if we do away with this rule. We will have people wanting to kill three bucks.

One buck rule limits the hunting experience for two season hunters(bow and Gun). I would favor point restriction instead.

Allow the taking of one doe or antler less deer along with one antlered(Buck) during firearm season.

As a lifetime license holder and deer hunter of this state since the late 70's , I think the new 1 buck a year rule is not a good rule and should be changed back to the previous year, I have read the reasons for the change but believe it will not have the impact that you are hoping for. Personally I have always tried to take the largest buck with a bow and gun and mostly at least 1 tag goes unfilled , now if I kill a buck in bow season , my season is basically done. I can remember when you had a 2 limit on bow and 1 on firearms. Please reconsider this law !!!

if the reason for the one buck rule was to increase the number of mature bucks for further hunting seasons then I think adding another weapon no matter the number of bucks taking will in a way defeat the reasoning of the one buck rule. the crossbow has its place for the handicap hunter if you are going to allow the use of a crossbow(archery made easy)then I see nothing wrong with smokeless powered. and I don't have a smokeless gun or plan to by one

Treat all deer hunters the same by allowing the crossbow hunters to take their ONE AND ONLY BUCK

I would like to comment on the current rule of taking only one buck per year. I am extremely upset with this law. I feel a hunter should be able to take a buck with the bow and firearm. People have different goals for hunting. I don't feel you should penalize all hunters just because some want larger bucks. (I don't think this will help the bucks get larger anyway.) I was really furious when I heard about this new law, especially after I just purchased a lifetime license. Not only have my hunting options been limited but I feel as like the DNR stole my money. I probably wouldn't have purchased the license had I known you were going to make this rule.

I personally do not feel the one buck rule is fair at all. I hunt mostly on state dnr property. I hunt bow ,shotgun ,muzzleloader. Since I cant use a doe permit on state land. I have to pass

on good legal bucks during bow season just so I can hunt during shotgun season. How many hunters actually took 3 bucks during the 3 seasons anyway .I've been hunting deer for 25 years or more I have never taken more than 2 in any year before your rule change. Is it fair to give up a buck during bow , shotgun. just so I might get to shoot one with my muzzle loader. I think not .At my age my joints are getting to the point I would be happy to use a crossbow to hunt all the time. Without getting special permit as a handicap hunter. I hate to think if I was using a crossbow , that I couldn't shoot my one buck per year. I guess next year I might have to spend my money for licenses north of the state line. thank you for letting an unhappy hunter speak his mind.

The one buck rule is not the answer to improving trophy bucks. You need to shorten the gun season or move the gun season out of the first rut.

We kill enough bucks without letting crossbow hunters kill them. If adopted, the next thing crossbow hunters will want, is to hunt during bow season, which would be unfair to bow hunters.

Please remove the one buck rule!. It punishes archery hunters while doing nothing to limit single season gun hunters. It also encourages poaching. Please put more thought into this rule. It will damage hunting in the long run because people stop hunting early now!

The new 1 buck rule is unfair to bow hunters and 2 season hunters. It also doesn't follow sound game management advice. Please remove this rule so everyone can enjoy hunting 2 seasons again!

I think that it would make more sense to take more does than the one buck rule to control the population. I know of many people who are now poaching or saying their wife/relative killed the additional buck. So if your proposed rule #2 is allowed then this will make poaching even easier. I mean gosh, I could then show up at a station with half a dozen bucks and say so and so really shot them. Please think before you act.

Open an early Primitive Muzzleloader season since there is only one buck rule.

Very much in favor of current one buck rule, I feel this was badly needed. Last season on Thanksgiving morning had 5 bucks racing after 2 does on a property in Noble county (managed to harvest a large body 3-4 year old 6 point out of that grouping). I do not know if that was a fluke or an indication that rule is working but I had not seen 5 bucks in the last three years combined that late in the season let alone all at one time! This year signs are looking good as tree rubs appear plentiful already. GOOD WORK !!

I strongly oppose the taking of a buck under the one buck rule during the crossbow season

Crossbow users should definitely be allowed to harvest a buck in the late season. However, their use should never be allowed in the early archery season.

The proposal on the taking of buck deer should forked horn or above should be one on each type of season

I also strongly support the one buck program and appreciate its extension. I wouldn't mind seeing the antler size change (i.e.: 3 inches) to something like 4 point minimum. This would require closer observation of the animal before shooting. It could alleviate accidents(maybe).

I'd like to know what would be the problem with allowing the use of crossbows during the entire deer season? Many bow hunters such as myself are getting on in years and haven't the physical ability to draw a compound or recurve bow effectively. Though we are not handicapped per say, the crossbow would produce clean kills and might possibly prevent the wounding and losing of an animal. There are many states in which the crossbow is legal throughout the deer season.

Crossbows should not be allowed in the woods in the first place. There is NO good reason to allow them to take a buck, period.

The last comment I have is; the "One buck" rule should be removed. A better way to achieve our goal of better bucks in the Indiana hunting woods is a second buck antler restriction. This would keep more hunters in the woods during the entire season and increasing the doe harvest and promoting a better balance in the deer herd. The numbers I have heard from 2002 show the doe kill as being down. So far this season I have seen fewer and smaller bucks than I have for the last 4 years. This tells me that the one buck law has hindered my hunting not helped it.

I think the most important rule change that we need is a point restriction on bucks of no less than 6 point bucks. The state of Pennsylvania has implemented this plan to a great outcome.

Deer proposal 6: This is VERY insulting to the Indiana archery hunters. First you establish the one buck rule to please the gun hunters with no real effect on the herd. Then you propose allowing the bubba's (mostly gun hunters to LAZY to learn archery) to use their cross-guns to take a buck. The state will not allow electronic calling devices because they want to promote better woods man ship, the VERY same argument could be made for cross-guns. This is not a traditional weapon for hunting and should NOT be afforded special status to allow the LAZY to enjoy the benefits of archery hunting. How many times is the DNR going to punish the bow hunters of this state?

abolish the 1 buck rule or change it to 1 buck for archery 0 bucks for firearms

ONE BUCK RULE- continue with this. I am a firm believer in doe harvest (yeah archery !)and some of the effects it has on deer population ratios and overall health of herds. lastly, it might even support trophy potential in the future. DNR should review more cities (Richmond, etc) for the possibility of more urban hunting zones for archery . if you look from a plane at times you can see concentrations closer to the city. soon people will complain when more and more deer arrive ! thanks for taking the time to read these commments. DEDICATED BOWHUNTER !

Get rid of the one buck rule ... it is ridiculous to punish bow hunters with something like this that accomplishes nothing!!!

Against any liberalizing of crossbow seasons, however, with the one-buck limit, I don't see a problem with allowing the buck to be taken with a crossbow.

I oppose any additional concessions for crossbows. These weapons should NOT be used in conjunction with an archery tag. The one-buck rule is only a trial. I do not believe this rule would be changed if the one-buck rule is reversed.

Yes I was just wondering when you will actually start listening to sportsmen instead of patronizing us with regenerated ambiguous statements .and allow use to have a bit of say about whether or not we want our 2 buck a year back or not the sportsmen of Indiana have spoken and you have turned a deaf ear ! The DNR is not in the business of trophy management . Just deer management you are forcing hunters new and old out of the sport by these ludicrous ideas. The bucks of Indiana belong to us the sportsmen and women of this state. The pushing of someone's deer management on us and loss of opportunity is a heinous act indeed perpetuated by money and unscrupulous individuals and enforced by what was once a very respected dnr, that is now being talked down and ridiculed by 75% of all deer hunters I have met. Please reconsider your popularity and credibility as a sports man friendly leadership is being judged by those who put you in high regard and your failure to here the masses call upon you for rectification of this situation could comeback to haunt your department by the loss of license money and the permanent loss of respect of sportsmen and the loss of sportsmen in general then who will keep the deer herd in check with no hunters to renew the old ones who are no longer able too ?Your department alone can not do it without hunters consider this statement no man or small group is an island we must work together or risk losing support by all you dictate to ! good luck on your decisions they influence all hunters and non-hunters alike .

Return to the 2 bucks per season (1 archery, 1 firearm). There are no shortages of bucks in Indiana. This was just a ploy by trophy hunters. I am a lifetime Indiana license holder.

I think it's a great idea to allow crossbow hunters the opportunity to fill their "one buck tag" during the crossbow season. I own a lifetime hunting license and I would like to see crossbow hunters have the opportunities as gun and bow hunters.

I like the idea of trying to have more and larger bucks, but it shouldn't penalize the hunter who has to hunt on state land because if they shoot a buck with his or her bow, then that takes the firearm season away for them. Because the state lands won't allow you to shoot does on their property for bonus deer tags. I think it would be a good idea to shoot one buck with bow and one with a firearm (only 2). Another topic is the licenses. You have taken all the licenses up in price, except the out of state license. More burden is put on the resident license holders, than non-resident. Why don't we charge non-residents the same as their state charges us? For example, Illinois pays \$120. For non-resident license but, if we go there it costs between \$200-\$300. To hunt there with all the fees we have to pay them. Well, maybe it's time they pay their share and the Indiana residents don't have to make up the difference. A little more money for the kitty.